From: PETERSON Jenn L
To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: RE: First draft of water TRV table
Date: 03/17/2008 10:28 AM

I am working on Section 10. Can I have until Tuesday COB?

-----Original Message-----
From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2008 8:18 AM
To: jeremy_buck@fws.gov; Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; PETERSON Jenn L; Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; rgensemer@parametrix.com; sheila@ridolfi.com; jay.field@noaa.gov; howp@critfc.org; jpeers@stratusconsulting.com
Subject: Fw: First draft of water TRV table

Here are the draft water TRVs. Please provide comments to Bob and Burt by Monday, March 17, 2008.

Eric
----- Forwarded by Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US on 03/13/2008 08:16 AM -----

"Robert W. Gensemer" <rgensemer@parametrix.com> 03/07/2008 03:07 PM

To: Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "Carrie A. Smith" <CSmith@parametrix.com>
cc: Brad Hermanson <BHermanson@parametrix.com>, David DeForest <deforest@parametrix.com>, Joe Volosin <volosin@parametrix.com>, Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "Robert W. Gensemer" <rgensemer@parametrix.com>, Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: First draft of water TRV table

Burt et al: Attached is a complete draft of the water TRVs for the BERA. I feel this is a pretty robust list because, after screening out chemicals from the SLERA, all but ca. 10 of these are based on either AWQC or Suter and Tsao Tier II values. I'll draft some introductory text to explain what I did if you need to, but its basically the following:

1. We created a Word version of LWG's round 2 report table with Eco-SLs for water in Attachment G3, then removed chemicals that screened out based on our SLERA.
2. Our primary review task was to address Jennifer's concerns that we should not be using ODEQ Table 33C values since they are considered by the state to only be used in support of "narrative" toxics criteria (and not risk based, according to Jennifer). For the most part, useable alternatives were available from other standard sources in our original selection hierarchy. In fact, some of these were the same as the 33C values anyway. All 33C values used in the round 2 report were checked even if they screened out. For the most part, chemicals that screened out using a 33C value still screened out even using the alternative TRV. The only exceptions were acrolein and chloroform, which screened back in using alternative TRVs and so are included in the attached table.
3. All TRVs that changed from the Round 2 report are highlighted in yellow for those who might only want to look at the new stuff. I've also shown my text edits to the TRV source and Comments columns in redline/strikeout to also highlight what changed.
4. PAHs. The chronic TRVs based on EPA's ESB report that used narcosis-based models to derive final chronic values for several PAHs (including alkylateds) were retained. This report was also checked for a corresponding set of acute values, but none were derived, so far as I could tell. If anyone knows differently, please say so and I'll dig further.
5. Any other remaining TRV that was NOT based on either an AWQC or Tier II value was checked against its original source if possible, or the hierarchy was searched again to look for alternatives. A few were found, particularly from Don MacDonald's excellent compilation of TRVs. Please also see two new footnotes (c and d) that point out a couple of alternatives to consider.
6. Note that I recommended two different sets of values for perchlorate. The first one was retained from the round 2 report based on the Goleman et al. 2002 amphbian study. The second set was from the Dean et al. 2002 study LWG originally proposed using back in 2006, and is basically equivalent to an AWQC in terms of the data used, derivation methods, and application to all aquatic life. As a result, I think the Dean numbers are more robust values for most aquatic receptors. If you guys agree with this, this might bring back amphbian-specific TRVs as existed once upon a

time. For the purposes of the BERA, I'd be fine with that, but that would open up another batch of TRVs to look at from their previous work.

7. TPHs. I did NOT include TRVs for TPHs because I still want to talk with this through with Burt and others first. The approach given in EPA's March 24, 2006 letter on water screening levels briefly discusses the basis of a value for gasoline range HCs (114 µg/L), and diesel range HCs (0.014 µg/L). I'm not that familiar with either value, but the brief justification given in the EPA letter seems reasonable to me. As you know, LWG elected not to use these values because "the proposed Eco SL is a narrative water quality number and does not meet the data acceptability criteria of a chronic endpoint based on survival, growth, or reproduction." While that may strictly be true, DEQ criteria related to sheen are also narrative, so perhaps the numbers proposed by EPA are still useful.

Anyway, I consider these ready for internal review at this time unless you guys feel differently. Go ahead and use these to start your work on the EqP sediment TRVs, Carrie. If subsequent review changes any, we can adjust! -Bob

Parametrix
inspired people - inspired solutions - making a difference

Robert W. Gensemer, Ph.D.
Operations Manager
phone: 541.791.1667, x-6510
fax: 541.791.1699
cell: 541.760.1511
rgensemer@parametrix.com
(See attached file: WaterTRVs 6Mar08.doc)